IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

REVIEW PETITION NO.72 OF 2007
IN
WRIT PETITION NO.1090 OF 2006

Rani Hanumant Yadav ...Petitioner

Vs.

The Society for the Rehabilitation
of the Handicapped, Miraj & Ors..Respondents

Shri Sunil D. Dighe, for the Petitioner
Mrs. M.P. Thakur, AGP for Respondent Nos. 5 and 6.
Mr. G.M. Sauagave for Respondent No.1 and 2.

CORAM: F.I. REBELLO & S.J.VAZIFDAR, JJ.
DATE : 18TH OCTOBER, 2007

P.C.

. The case of the petitioner is that she ought to have been regularised. The petitioner had come to this Court by way of Writ Petition No.1090 of 2006. After setting out the facts and the orders in the earlier petitions, we had noted that the petitioner had approached this Court after she had participated in the selection process and more meritorious candidate was selected. The Petitioner herself was not in service when she was interviewed. Considering that we had observed that if the petitioner was aggrieved by the selection of the other candidates it is for the Petitioner to challenge the said selection by appropriate proceedings. Instead of doing that, a Review Petition has been filed wherein once again reiterating that she ought to have been regularised in terms of the order in Writ Petition No.6728 of 2004. Our attention is invited to the order dated 8th September, 2000. That was purely an interim order permitting the petitioner like other petitioners before the

Court to appear for the examination. When the petition came up for final hearing the petitioner withdrew the petition as can be seen from the order dated 23rd June, 2004.

. In so far as the petitioners in Writ Petition No.6728 of 2004 and the other petitions the only relief granted was that those petitioners were allowed to continue in their posts till a duly selected reserved caste category candidate is available and noted that they shall be paid their salary as per the Rules. In other words it was an ad hoc arrangement made till such time a duly selected candidate become available.

. In the instant case on a vacancy being available the management wanted to fill up the vacancy. The petitioner appeared for the interview. The Petitioner was not selected. Consequently there is no question of reviewing the order in the absence of the petitioner making out a case of an error apparent on the face of the record. The Review Application does not disclose any error of law apparent on the face of the record. Hence review petition dismissed.

(S.J. VAZIFDAR,J.) **(F.I.REBELLO,J.)**